REMARKS

Claims 1-74 remain pending in this application. Each of the pending claims is believed to define an invention that is novel and unobvious over the cited references. Favorable reconsideration of this case is respectfully requested.

Referring to Figure 6, embodiments of the present invention relate to the combining of application gateway functionality to a firewall that controls the transmission of TCP/IP packets. At step 601, the packet processor part 110 receives a packet and examines the packet to determine whether the packet contain digital data that pertains to a certain protocol. If the packet is found to contain digital data that pertains the certain protocol, the packet processor part redirects the packet to an application gateway part, per step 602 and 607. The application gateway part then processes the packet. If the packet does not contain digital data that pertains to the certain protocol, the packet is processed at the packet processor part 110, please see the present specification page 25, lines 23-25.

Claims 1-3, 7, 8, 12, 14, 19-31, 33-40, 43-46, 49-55, 58-63, 66-70, 73 and 74 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,754,706 to Gbadegesin.

Gbadegesin relates to the combination of network address translation and proxy application functionality into a gateway process. In Ggadegesin, packets are provided to translation module 106. Translation module 106 determines if the packet is from a recognized or an unrecognized session. For packets in new and unrecognized sections, module 106 forwards the packets to proxy 104, please see Gbadegesin Figure 10, column 7, lines 66 – column 8, line 30, and column 9, line 66 – column 10, line 36. The proxy 104 provides redirects that provide redirection of all message packets initially to the proxy 104, column 8, lines 26-30. Accordingly, in Gbadegesin, packets that relate to an unrecognized session are forwarded from the module 106 to the proxy 104.

For packets that relate to a recognized session, the packet is not redirected to the proxy 104. If the module 106 determines that the packet relates a recognized session, the trip to the proxy 104 is short circuited. The module 106 automatically translates these packet's address according to a mapping 118, please see column 10, lines 18-33 and Figure 10.

In summary, the module 106 in Gbadegesin determines whether a packet relates to a recognized or unrecognized session. If a packet relates to an unrecognized session, the packet is forwarded to proxy 104. If the packet relates to recognized session, the module 106 translates the address according to a dynamic mapping 118 and forwards the packet accordingly. There is no mention anywhere in Gbadegesin of any function that determines whether the packet contains digital data that pertains to a certain protocol and redirecting the packet based on that determination. None of module 106 or proxy 104 in Gbadegesin make any determination of the protocol of the data in the packet or base any decision upon such a determination. There is simply no mention in Gbadegesin of these features.

In comparison the independent claims of the present application recite that the packet processor part determines whether the packet contains digital data that pertains to a certain protocol. Packets that include data that pertain the certain protocol are redirected to an application gateway part for processing. Those packets that do not contain digital data that pertains to the certain protocol are processed by the packet processor part. Thus, it is clear that the claims recite that the packets are redirected based on the protocol of the data in the packet. This is entirely different from the system in Gbadegesin which the kernel mode translation module forwards data based on whether the data belongs to an unrecognized session or a recognized session. Each of independent claims 1, 39, 43, 47, 51, 53, 62, 64, 66, 68, 69, 71, and 73 include similar recitations. Each of these claims and the claims depending therefrom are therefore in condition for allowance.

In view of the above, it is clear the that cited references fail to teach each and every element recited in the rejected claim as is required by 35 U.S.C. 102. Therefore, the withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner is asserting that the description in Gbadegesin of routing of every packet for TCP port 80 be directed to the transparent proxy 104 as corresponding to the claimed examining the packet at the packet processor part in order to determine whether the packet contains digital data that pertains to a certain protocol, Applicants respectfully disagree. The claims recite that the packets are examined at the packet processor part. It is determined whether the packet contains data that pertains to a certain protocol. Simply routing a session destined for TCP port 80 is not the same

as examining the packet at the packet processor part to determine whether the packet contains

digital data that pertains to a certain protocol. This process in Gbadegesin certainly does not

involve redirecting the packets that have data the correspond to the certain protocol to an application

gateway.

Claims 4, 15-17, 41, 42, 47, 48, 56, 57, 64, 65, 71, and 72 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are

rejected as being unpatentable over Gbadegesin in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No.

2002/0124090 to Poier (hereinafter "Poier").

(A) Claims 4 and 15-17 depend from claim 1. Claim 1 is in condition for allowance, as

discussed above. Thus, claims 4 and 15-17 are also in condition for allowance because of their

dependence on an allowable claim.

(B) On page 21, the Action rejects claim 41. Claim 41 recites "A method for handling

digital data packets at a logical borderline that separates an untrusted packet-switched information

network from a protected domain, comprising the steps of: intercepting, at a packet processor part, a

packet that is in transit between the untrusted packet-switched information network and the

protected domain, examining the packet at the packet processor part in order to determine, whether

the packet contains digital data that pertains to a certain protocol, if the packet is **not found** to

contain digital data that would pertain to said certain protocol, **processing the packet at the packet**

processor part, and if the packet **is found** to contain digital data that pertains to said certain

protocol, prepending a header to the packet at the packet processor part, the prepended   header

containing a value that identifies an application gateway part as the destination of the packet, and

redirecting the packet to the application gateway part, stripping the prepended header from the

packet at the application gateway part and using the original value of the destination information

field in the packet at the application gateway part in processing the packet according to a set of

processing rules based on obedience to said certain protocol."

The Action relies on Poier for a teaching of prepending a header. However, Poier does not

teach the above identified claim elements which are also not taught by Gsbadegesin. For reasons

similar to those given in support of claim 1, claim 41 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 42, which depends from claim 41, is also in condition for allowance due to its

dependence on an allowable claim.

27

(C) Claim 47 is allowable for reasons analogous to those given in support of claim 41.

Claim 48, which depends from claim 47, is also in condition for allowance due to its dependence on an allowable claim.

(D) Claims 56 and 57 depend from claim 53. Claim 53 is in condition for allowance, as discussed above. Thus, claims 56 and 57 are also in condition for allowance because of their dependence on an allowable claim.

(E) The Action rejects claim 64. Claim 64 is allowable for reasons analogous to those given in support of claim 41.

Claim 65, which depends from claim 64, is also in condition for allowance due to its dependence on an allowable claim.

(F) The Action rejects claim 71. Claim 71 is allowable for reasons analogous to those given in support of claim 41.

Claim 72, which depends from claim 71, is also in condition for allowance due to its dependence on an allowable claim.

II.   Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gbadegesin in view of Poier, in further view of the article The TCP Datagram, I wanted to know and now you can too (hereinafter "Datagram").

Claims 5 and 6 depend from claim 1. Claim 1 is in condition for allowance, as discussed above. Thus, claims 5 and 6 are also in condition for allowance because of their dependence on an allowable claim.

III.   Claims 9, 10, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gbadegesin in view of the article 3.3 Connectionless Transport: UDP (hereinafter "UDP").

Claims 9, 10, and 32 depend from claim 1. Claim 1 is in condition for allowance, as discussed above. Thus, claims 9, 10, and 32 are also in condition for allowance because of their dependence on an allowable claim.

IV.   Claims 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gbadegesin in view of the article <u>WTCP: an Efficient Transmission Control Protocol for Wired/Wireless Internetworking</u> to Cheng (hereinafter "Cheng").

Claims 11 and 13 depend from claim 1. Claim 1 is in condition for allowance, as discussed above. Thus, claims 11 and 13 are also in condition for allowance because of their dependence on an allowable claim.

V.   Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gbadegesin in view of Poier, in further view of the article <u>RFC 1928 – SOCKS Protocol Version 5</u> to Leech (hereinafter "Leech").

Claim 18 depends from claim 1. Claim 1 is in condition for allowance, as discussed above. Thus, claim 18 is also in condition for allowance because of its dependence on an allowable claim.

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner is of the opinion that the prosecution of this application would be advanced by a personal interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone undersigned counsel to arranged for such an interview.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee necessitated by this Amendment to our Deposit Account No. 22-0261.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: 7/24/06

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Jeffri A. Kaminski
  Registration No.: 42,709
James R. Burdett
  Registration No.: 31,594
VENABLE LLP
P.O. Box 34385
Washington, DC 20043-9998
(202) 344-4000
(202) 344-8300 (Fax)
Attorney/Agent For Applicant